

**TW Road Comments**  
**Draft Final Engineering Study Report**  
**Dated May 21, 2008**

**CCPW Comments:**

Several comments on spelling were made. We will not list all these comments; but, we will address all of them. The following were the comments where a formal response was deemed appropriate.

**1 - Comment:** Page 1, column 3, Insert after Bullet 7 - Indicate how many supported East Alt. Corridor (It was part of the question in the questionnaire).

**Response:** Comply

**2- Comment:** Page 3, column 3, Bullet 2 – TW Rd “Major collector,” should be “Minor arterial.”

**Response:** Comply

**3- Comment:** Page 4, column 2, Bullet 3 - “two 8 foot pedestrian paths” replace two with one.

**Response:** Comply

**4 - Comment:** Page 5, column 2, Paragraph 2 - term “maximum” is questioned.

**Response:** Good catch, minimum is appropriate.

**5 - Comment:** Page 5, column 3, Paragraph 2 - term “maximum” is questioned.

**Response:** Minimum is appropriate.

**6 - Comment:** Page 8, column 3, Paragraph 3 - “The FMPO provided accident...” replace The FMPO with Coconino County.

**Response:** Comply

**7 - Comment:** Page 8, column 3, Paragraph 3 - Add -ly to potential.

**Response:** Comply

**8 - Comment:** Page 9, column 1, Paragraph 1 - “... 2,100’ approaching I-10.” replace I-10 with I-40.

**Response:** Comply

**9 - Comment:** Page 11, column 1, Paragraph 1 - Have these locations been identified at current conditions?

**Response:** The right turn locations have not been identified. There was not an extensive enough set of traffic counts collected; nor do we have sufficient forecast data for future development to conduct this evaluation. This is a task that should be completed for all future developments and concurrent to future preliminary design (Design Concept Report) studies.

**10 - Comment:** Page 12, column 3, 2<sup>nd</sup> Set of Bullets Down, Bullet 3 - Topography?

**Response:** We did not evaluate the topography at the Rio Rancho Intersection. This is a task that should be completed with a future preliminary design (Design Concept Report) study.

**11 - Comment:** Page 14, column 3, Paragraph 5 - How can this be accomplished for existing driveways closer than 150'?

**Response:** The possibility to move a driveway that is currently within 150' of the centerline of an intersection to improve access management is to make it a stipulation during the redevelopment of the parcel. A driveway in this location could also be moved when the County comes through with shoulder widening and/or adds a continuous left turn lane.

**12 - Comment:** Page 16, Figure 4.14 - Not within clear zone.

**Response:** Note within the figure is the text, "breakaway base required." Due to the width of the corridor, we considered the design necessary to move the mailboxes outside the clear zone. It took a lot of length to develop the geometry to achieve the offset to get outside the clear zone. In general, it would be very expensive for the grading, walls, etc. The use of breakaway bases was thought to be viable and cost efficient. We will add a 4<sup>th</sup> bullet to the *Conclusions for Mailboxes and Bus Pullouts* Section stating that "all mailbox bases must be breakaway."

**13 - Comment:** Page 17, Figure 4.15 - Must be breakaway design.

**Response:** See the response to question # 11.

**14 - Comment:** Page 17, Figure 4.17 - Gang mail boxes or clusters should be out of clear zone.

**Response:** See the response to question # 11.

**15 - Comment:** Page 18, Figure 4.18 - 60' Typical.

**Response:** With your permission, we would like to leave this as shown, 50'. The intent is to show that the "50' sight triangle" will work regardless of whether the approaching street is 50' or 60' in width.

**16 - Comment:** Page 19, Column 1, Paragraph 2 - "...within the existing (corridor?) and long term facilities currently included in the FMPO Long Range Plan."

**Response:** We can change the word "facilities" to "corridors. We will also add ly to the word "current."

**17 - Comment:** Page 20, Figure 6.2 - No Road (Rain Valley Road does not extend to Hwy 66).

**Response:** The conclusions suggest that the Rain Valley Corridor “be added” to the overall transportation system with the addition of the WAC. That is to say, it is “conceptual,” not existing.

**18 - Comment:** Page 21, Figure 7.1 - Crossed out Picture Canyon.

**Response:** We can not change this map. It is published by others. I believe it is the name of the trail.

**19 - Comment:** Plans 4 of 12 – Question regarding a potential roundabout at Rain Valley Rd.

**Response:** This would only be needed if the Rain Valley Rd Corridor is developed to provide continuity to Route 66. This is suggested as the local circulation route as a companion to the WAC. However, after thinking about it now, since there is no alternative route to US 89 in close proximity, maybe Rain Valley Rd should be considered with or without the WAC.

**20 - Comment:** Plans 6 of 12 (and others) – Comment on “optional trail on forest land” based on the understanding that the Forest Service is looking to sell these parts of their property.

**Response:** Then our thought would be that any development plan would need to incorporate the path into their master plan as a stipulation for approval. And, it is only an option. There is also a proposed path shown within the TW Rd corridor right-of-way.

## **FMPO Comments:**

**21 - Comment:** County Supervisor Hill's direction to attribute evaluation of the US 89 bypass (WAC) to the FMPO and ADOT. Recommending WAC for consideration in regional plan process, not in plan itself.

**Response:** Comply, see text additions on: page 18, 2<sup>nd</sup> column, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph; & see page 19, 3<sup>rd</sup> column.

**22 - Comment:** Need for explanation of future land use conditions

**Response:** Section 2.1.4 and Table 2.1 provide the data for the AZ State Lands and Forest Service Lands that may develop. Do you have something more in mind?

**23 - Comment:** Helpfulness of adding mileposts to all relevant figures

**Response:** Most of the figures in the report are schematic, so milepost data would not “fit.” We prefer not to clutter aerial figures such as 4.1, which is for traffic volume data, with milepost information. Figure 4.10 just happens to fall in an area between mileposts. Your interest is understood, we use mileposts for limits in our discussions. But I don’t know where we could effectively add it.

**24 - Comment:** Identification of T-W functional class and its relationship to (MCDOT) *Table 2.1*, (page 6) also further explanation on the use of 6,000 vpd as the threshold instead of 8,000 vpd.

**Response:** The functional classification for TW Rd is shown in the 3<sup>rd</sup> column on page 3 of 21. In the Coconino County system, TW Rd is a Minor Arterial. In the MCDOT system, TW Rd would be similar to a Major Collector, per *Table 2.1*., which is now called **Table 3.3**.

To clarify the issue, we will add the following sentence at the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph in *Section 3.3*; "Note the roadway classifications used in *Table 2.1* (now **Table 3.3**) do not match those used by Coconino County."

**25 - Comment:** Regarding land use in general. At the end of Section 2.1.3 please add the following statement. "Development levels for 2030 are based on the Flagstaff Area Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan and developed in consultation with Coconino County."

**Response:** Comply

**26 - Comment:** Regarding Table 2.1. Please precede the table with the following statement. "In order to test the ability of any recommended improvements to handle unexpected growth the model was loaded with a worse case scenario. In this scenario, an additional 3,859 homes and the trips they generate were added to the model. These are described in Table 2.1 below. The additional trips did not create the need for more additional capacity." You may wish to additionally reference page A-15 where the model results are.

**Response:** Comply

**27 - Comment:** Regarding section 3.3. Please change the table number reference (for MCDOT Table 2.1) to 3.3 and then change the following tables accordingly. Please add the following statement (an amendment to your follow-up e-mail) to the end of the second paragraph. "CCPW agreed that the Maricopa County "Rural - Major Collector" standard was the best match for Coconino County's minor arterial designation for Townsend-Winona Road."

**Response:** Comply too both parts of the comment.

**28 - Comment:** After the italicized heading for the last paragraph at end of page 6 of 21 insert parenthetical statement "(Note: MCDOT standards for rural minor collector and rural major collector are 2 lanes and 3 lanes, respectively)." At end of paragraph change "collates" to "correlates"

**Response:** Comply, though I elected to place the additional text after the table. Comply with "correlates"

**28 - Comment:** Table 3.4 page 8 title says 2006, first column says 2005

**Response:** I could not find this. No action.

**29 - Comment:** Page 11 of 21: Right turn evaluations. It isn't clear how right-turn-lane will be handled relative to the shoulder (is it turn lane only or turn lane plus additional width for full or partial shoulder?).

**Response:** We did not try to define it. However, it is suggested that the typical 10' shoulder be reduced to 2' through the taper that adds the 12' right turn lane. In effect, you have 14' of pavement; a 12' lane and 2' shoulder. This needs to be addressed at the next level of study.

**30 - Comment:** Page 11 of 21 - next to last bullet "why" = "while", last bullet - sever = severe (two occurrences)

**Response:** Comply on both.

**31 - Comment:** page 12, Table 4.1 showing overall intersection LOS would be valuable. At the very end of the page is a reference to SB Koch Field operating at LOS F. It isn't reflected in the table.

**Response:** The data for the SB Koch Field approach in Table 4.1 represents the average for all the movements/lanes on any one of the four approaches. However, within that average for the SB movement there are two movements/lanes; the SB Lt/Th movement/lane and the SB Rt movement/lane. The SB LT/Th movement/lane incurs 58.4 seconds of delay for a LOS F and the SB Rt movement/lane incurs 10.2 seconds of delay for a LOS B. Their average delay is 31.5 seconds of delay for a composite LOS D; which is what is shown in Table 4.1.

**32 - Comment:** Page 20, 6.3 After the sentence, "Note by staying west of the Gas Pump Station...." add the following sentence. "A range of mitigation strategies should be considered if this project moves forward through the regional transportation plan update. These could include horizontal and vertical alignment adjustments to reduce visual and sound impacts, sound walls, landscaping, and others."

**Response:** You are absolutely correct. That said, what you are suggesting is a requirement of the process that needs to follow if considered. As we are not mentioning any of the other requirements in this document, we suggest we remain consistent and not insert just this one.

**33 - Comment:** Page 20 - I'm not sure that I agree entirely with the conclusion reached regarding Rain Valley Road. The modeling and discussion held suggest something on the order of Koch Field Rd in terms of traffic level and function. It has plenty of driveways and as a regular user; I find it to operate satisfactorily. Knowing that the south end may develop in a more suburban fashion, stronger access control may be warranted there.

**Response:** It is agreed that some access is acceptable. The word "no" was changed to "a limited number of" when referencing driveways to be allowed.